

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12 are independent. In the Office Action dated March 28, 2003, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Following this response, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12, and 14-20 remain in this application. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections and objections in turn.

I. Objection to the Claims

In the Office Action dated March 28, 2003, the Examiner objected to Claims 14-17 as containing various informalities. Claims 14-17 have been amended to address these informalities and do not narrow the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

II. Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings stating that FIGs. 31, 32A, and 32B should be designated as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. Subject to the approval of the Examiner, substitute FIGs. 31, 32A, and 32B are submitted designating FIGs. 31, 32A, and 32B as --Prior Art-- in red. Applicant respectfully submits that substitute FIGs. 31, 32A, and 32B overcome this objection and add no new matter.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

III. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 19 has been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

IV. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,668,998 ("*Mason*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because *Mason* would not have led to the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12. Claims 3, 8, 10, and 13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that it recites, for example, defining a sequence carried out between the respective classes wherein said object system interface part of said framework for service providing system converts external data, which are exchanged between said object system interface part and said object system, into a format of intermediate data which is independent of said protocol, and said integrated control part of said framework for service providing system converts said intermediate data into a format of internal data which is handled in said service providing system, said data holding part and user interface part of said framework for service providing system handling said internal data which have been converted by said integrated control part.

In addition, amended Claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that it recites, for example, said object system interface part converts external data, which are exchanged between said object system interface part and said object system, into a format of intermediate data which is independent of said protocol, and said integrated control part converts said intermediate data into a format of internal data which is handled in said service providing system, said data holding part and user interface part handling said internal data which have been converted by said integrated control part.

Also, amended Claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that it recites, for example, said object system interface means converts external data, which are exchanged between said object system interface means and said object system, into a format of intermediate data which is independent of said protocol, and said integrated control means converts said intermediate data into a format of internal data which is handled in said service providing system, said data holding means and user interface means handling said internal data which have been converted by said integrated control means.

Furthermore, Claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that it recites, for example, wherein said object system interface means converts external data, which are exchanged between said object system interface means and said object system, into a format of intermediate data which is independent of a protocol, and said integrated converts said intermediate data into a format of internal data which is handled by said internal system.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Moreover, amended Claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that it recites, for example, said object system interface part converts external data, which are exchanged between said object system interface part and said object system, into a format of intermediate data which is independent of said protocol, and said integrated control part converts said intermediate data into a format of internal data which is handled in said service providing system, said data holding part and user interface part handling said internal data which have been converted by said integrated control part.

In contrast with Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12, the API toolkit framework of *Mason* is merely an interface through which an application programmer customizes individual objects in the framework or alters parameter values and object behavior when developing the framework. *Mason's* API toolkit framework does not suggest or disclose the user interface part, as recited in Claim 1, for example, which receives instructions from a user and presents data to the user when the user employs the constructed service providing system.

In addition, the handler object (SCP/SCU) of *Mason* does not correspond to either of the integrated control part or the object system interface part, as recited in Claim 1, for example. Specifically, the handler object (SCP/SCU) of *Mason* is merely used for transferring the messages in DICOM standard. Consequently, *Mason's* handler object does not teach, suggest, or disclose the integrated control part, as recited in Claim 1, which controls the data holding part, the user interface part, and the object system interface part.

Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 2 of *Mason*, the handler object (SCP/SCU) (15, 19) merely decodes the message (see 14, 18) that comes from the service interface object (11, 16) of another application and does not carry out encoding of the message. As also shown in Fig. 2 of *Mason*, encoding of the message is carried out in the service interface object (11, 16).

Moreover, in *Mason*, for example, exchanging data between applications is carried out by two different objects, the service interface object (11, 16) and the handler object (SCP/SCU) (15, 19). In contrast, the invention as recited in Claim 1 exchanges data between the service providing system and the object system only one part, for example, the object system interface part, independently of other parts, for example, the data holding part, the user interface part, and the object system interface part.

Also, as stated above, the encoding and decoding of the message are carried out in the separate objects, for example, the service interface object (11, 16) and the handler object (SCP/SCU) in the framework of *Mason*. Therefore, *Mason* does not disclose or suggest the present invention, as recited in Claim 1, because, for example, *Mason* does not disclose or suggest that encoding and decoding may be carried out in the object system interface part independent of other parts, for example, the data holding part, the user interface part, and the object system interface part.

In short, *Mason* would not have led to the invention, as recited in Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12 because *Mason* at least does not disclose or suggest the above referenced recitations of independent Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12 patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-6, and 14-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons above regarding independent Claims 1 and 12 and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2, 4-6, and 14-20.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 28, 2003

By: See Ext. for Signature
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640
(404) 653-6559

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com